

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of any changes to the claims and the remarks herein. Please contact the undersigned to conduct a telephone interview in accordance with MPEP 713.01 to resolve any remaining requirements and/or issues prior to sending another Office Action. Relevant portions of MPEP 713.01 are included on the signature page of this amendment.

Claims 1-27 and 41-47 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-27, 41-47 and 52 of copending Application No. 10/145,661. Enclosed herein is a terminal disclaimer which overcomes the rejection.

Claims 1-27, 41-52 and 54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beaman et al (US 5,371,654). Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons of record.

Claim 53 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beaman et al (US 5,371,654). Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons of record. All claims of the present application and US 5,371,654 are commonly owned from the date of their invention by the assignee of both, the International Business Machines Corporation.

In view of the changes to the claims and the remarks herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the above-identified application. If the Examiner wishes to discuss the application further, or if additional information would be required, the undersigned will cooperate fully to assist in the prosecution of this application.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper and any previous paper to deposit account 09-0468.

If the above-identified Examiner's Action is a final Action, and if the above-identified application will be abandoned without further action by applicants, applicants file a Notice of Appeal to the Board of Appeals and Interferences appealing the final rejection of the claims in the above-identified Examiner's Action. Please charge deposit account 09-0468 any fee necessary to enter such Notice of Appeal.

In the event that this amendment does not result in allowance of all such claims, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone interview at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

MPEP 713.01 states in part as follows:

Where the response to a first complete action includes a request for an interview or a telephone consultation to be initiated by the examiner, ... the examiner, as soon as he or she has considered the effect of the response, should grant such request if it appears that the interview or consultation would result in expediting the case to a final action.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Dr. Daniel P. Morris, Esq.
Reg. No. 32,053
Phone No. (914) 945-3217

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
P. O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598